

RELATIVE DEFINABILITY OF n -GENERICS

WEI WANG

ABSTRACT. A set $G \subseteq \omega$ is n -generic for a positive integer n if and only if every Σ_n^0 formula of G is decided by a finite initial segment of G in the sense of Cohen forcing. It is shown here that every n -generic set G is properly Σ_n^0 in some G -recursive X . As a corollary, we also prove that for every $n > 1$ and every n -generic set G there exists a G -recursive X which is generalized low_n but not generalized low_{n-1} . Thus we confirm two conjectures of Jockusch [6].

1. INTRODUCTION

In recursion theory, Cohen generics have been intensively studied and are usually just called *generics*. Jockusch [6] was the first systematic study of the Turing degrees of generics and introduced the notion of n -genericity. A set G is n -generic for a positive n if and only if every Σ_n^0 or Π_n^0 fact of G is forced by a finite initial segment of G . For recursion theorists, it is natural to investigate which properties of generics hold for n -generics and which techniques applied to generics could also be applied to n -generics. On the other hand, n -generics are more handy for most recursion theoretic techniques. So n -generics, in particular 1-generics, are even more intensively studied and play important roles in recursion theory.

An interesting recursion theoretic property of 1-generics is their relative recursive enumerability. Recall that X is *recursively enumerable in and above* (r.e.a. for short) Y if X is Y -r.e. and $Y <_T X$. In terms of definability, if X is r.e.a. Y then X is properly Σ_1^0 in Y . An *r.e.a.* set is one which is r.e.a. some other set, and an *r.e.a. degree* is a Turing degree containing an r.e.a. set. In the theory of Turing degrees, the r.e.a. degrees have been proven important. Jockusch [6] proved that every 1-generic set G is r.e.a. and thus the 1-generic degrees form a subclass of the r.e.a. degrees. In the same paper, it was also shown that every 2-generic G is properly Σ_2^0 in some G -recursive X . The first result connects 1-generic degrees with recursively enumerable degrees. For example, combining the relative recursive enumerability of 1-generics and a theorem of r.e. degrees (Yates [10]) Jockusch concluded that the Turing degrees below a 1-generic degree are not dense ([6, Corollary 5.3]). Moreover, as the r.e.a. degrees form a large and well-known class (e.g., see [4]), the first result seems more popular. However, the proofs of the two results are similar. Both proofs were done by cleverly defining some functionals which produce the desired X for sufficient generic G . But these clever functionals do not seem to admit easy generalizations to large n . So Jockusch posted a general conjecture that every n -generic G is properly Σ_n^0 in some G -recursive X for every positive integer n ([6, Conjecture 5.13]).

The main purpose of this article is to confirm the above conjecture of Jockusch. We provide a proof in §2. Then we present some consequences of our main theorem and also its proof in §3, including a confirmation of [6, Conjecture 5.14]. We also post some open questions in §3.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03D28, 03D25.

Key words and phrases. Turing degrees, generic.

This research was partially supported by NSF Grant 11471342 of China.

Our terminology is rather standard. A set $X \subseteq \omega$ is usually identified with its characteristic function in 2^ω . We write $\sigma \subseteq \tau$ if σ is an initial segment of $\tau \in 2^{<\omega}$ and $\sigma \subset \tau$ if $\sigma \subseteq \tau$ and $\sigma \neq \tau$. The concatenation of two finite sequences s and t is simply denoted by st . A set $D \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ is *dense* if every $\sigma \in 2^{<\omega}$ is extended by some $\tau \in D$. For a fixed $\rho \in 2^{<\omega}$, a set $D \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ is *dense below* ρ if every extension of ρ is extended by some element of D . For a fixed $G \subseteq \omega$, a set $D \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ is *dense along* G if every finite initial segment of G is extended by some element of D .

Besides [6], we also recommend Kumabe [8] for background of n -generic degrees.

2. THE MAIN THEOREM

In this section we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *For each $n > 0$, there exists a partial recursive functional Γ such that if G is n -generic then $\Gamma(G)$ is total and G is properly Σ_n^0 in $\Gamma(G)$.*

To prove Theorem 2.1, we recursively construct two functionals Γ and Δ such that the followings hold for every n -generic G :

- (A1) $X = \Gamma(G)$ is total.
- (A2) $\omega - G$ is not Σ_n^X .
- (A3) $\Delta_k(X; x_0, \dots, x_{n-k})$ is total for each $k < n - 1$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_0(X; x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) &= \Delta(X; x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}), \\ \Delta_{k+1}(X; x_0, \dots, x_{n-k-2}) &= \lim_{x_{n-k-1}} \Delta_k(X; x_0, \dots, x_{n-k-2}, x_{n-k-1}). \end{aligned}$$

- (A4) $x \in G \leftrightarrow \Delta_{n-1}(X; x) = 1$ for every x .

By (A3-4), G is Σ_n^X .

In the construction, we refine (A1-4) to countably many requirements and recursively assign to each requirement countably many stages so that every stage is assigned to exactly one requirement. A stage assigned to a requirement R is called an *R-stage*. At each stage we construct finite approximations of Γ and Δ . If stage s is an *R-stage* then *the R-module* performs a finite set of actions for the sake of meeting requirement R .

Firstly, we sketch the basic strategies for (A1-4). For convenience, we write $\vec{x}$ for a tuple $(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1})$ where k is the length of $\vec{x}$.

2.1. Meeting (A1). We view Γ as a partial recursive function $\Gamma : 2^{<\omega} \rightarrow 2^{<\omega}$ which is continuous, i.e., $\Gamma(\sigma) \subseteq \Gamma(\tau)$ whenever $\sigma \subseteq \tau$. To meet (A1), we require that

$$(2.1) \quad \{\sigma : |\Gamma(\sigma)| > n\} \text{ is dense in } 2^{<\omega} \text{ for each } n.$$

So we have the following requirements:

$$P(\sigma, n) : (\exists \tau \supset \sigma) |\Gamma(\tau)| > n.$$

A $P(\sigma, n)$ -module picks some $\tau \supset \sigma$ and defines $\Gamma(\tau)$ as some ξ of length $n + 1$.

2.2. Meeting (A2). Suppose that $X = \Gamma(G)$ is total. We replace (A2) with the following requirement for each Σ_n^0 formula θ :

$$(2.2) \quad (\forall x \notin G)(\exists \sigma \supset G \upharpoonright x) \sigma \Vdash \theta(\Gamma(G), x) \rightarrow \{\sigma : (\exists x) \sigma(x) = 1 \wedge \sigma \Vdash \theta(\Gamma(G), x)\} \text{ is dense along } G.$$

As $n > 0$ and Γ satisfies (2.1), $\sigma \Vdash \theta(\Gamma(G), x)$ is a Σ_n^0 predicate of G, σ and x . Assume that $G = \{x : \neg \theta(\Gamma(G), x)\}$ for a Σ_n^0 formula θ . By the n -genericity of G , the premise of (2.2) holds. Applying (2.2) and the n -genericity of G again, there exist $x \in G$ and $\sigma \subset G$ with $\sigma \Vdash \theta(\Gamma(G), x)$ and thus $\theta(\Gamma(G), x)$ holds. So we have a desired contradiction. This proves that (2.2) implies (A2).

The strategy to meet (2.2) is as follows: Whenever we see a triple (ρ, x, σ) such that $|\rho| = x$ and $\rho\langle 0 \rangle \subseteq \sigma$, we pick some $\tau \supseteq \rho\langle 1 \rangle$ and expect that if σ forces a Π_{n-1}^0 formula φ of $\Gamma(G)$ then τ forces φ too. We call this τ the *deputy* of σ . Assume that every deputy meets our expectation and the premise of (2.2) holds. We write each Σ_n^0 formula θ as $(\exists y)\varphi$ where φ is Π_{n-1}^0 . If $\sigma \supset G \restriction x$ and $\sigma \Vdash \theta(\Gamma(G), x)$ then either $\sigma(x) = 1$ or there exist y and σ' with $\sigma \subset \sigma' \Vdash \varphi(\Gamma(G), x, y)$. Hence $\tau(x) = 1$ and $\tau \Vdash \varphi(\Gamma(G), x, y)$ as well if τ is the deputy of $d(\sigma')$. So the above strategy guarantees (2.2).

Suppose that $\rho \subset \rho\langle 0 \rangle \subset \sigma$ and τ is the deputy of σ . In order to figure out how to make τ do its job as the deputy of σ , let us begin with small n 's.

- If $n = 1$ and φ is a Π_0^0 formula then there is a recursive subset P of $2^{<\omega}$ such that $\sigma \Vdash \varphi(\Gamma(G))$ if and only if $\xi \in P$ for some $\xi \in \Gamma(\sigma)$. So it suffices to define $\Gamma(\tau) \supset \Gamma(\sigma)$. Note that this is the key ingredient of Lemma 5.2 in Jockusch [6].
- Suppose that $n = 2$. We need another layer of deputies. To distinguish deputies at different layers, we call τ the 1-deputy of σ . We pick 0-deputies $\mu \supset \sigma$ for ν densely below τ and make these deputies act as in the above paragraph. To ensure that the above paragraph could be applied to 0-deputies, we certainly need that $\Gamma(\tau) \supseteq \Gamma(\sigma)$. With this strategy, if $\varphi = (\forall y)\psi$ where ψ is Σ_0^0 and $\tau \nVdash \varphi(\Gamma(G))$, then some $\nu \supset \tau$ forces some $\neg\psi(\Gamma(G), k)$ and so does the 0-deputy $\mu \supset \sigma$ of some extension of ν . Hence $\sigma \nVdash \varphi(\Gamma(G))$ either. The reader may have noticed the similarity between the above argument and that following the proof of [6, Lemma 5.10].

Note that each σ may extend more than one $\rho\langle 0 \rangle$. So to be precise, the corresponding $(n-1)$ -deputy should be called something like the $(\rho, n-1)$ -deputy of σ . For simplicity, we only define deputies for sequences of fresh lengths at each stage. We also require that each σ has at most one deputy and thus it cannot have deputies at different layers. So the deputy of σ is unambiguous. But we may still use the terms k -deputy and (ρ, k) -deputy occasionally. For bookkeeping purpose, we simultaneously construct a partial recursive injection d such that if $d(\sigma)$ is defined then it is the deputy of σ .

Based on these simple examples, we design a hierarchy of requirements:

$$D(0, \sigma, \tau) : \Gamma(\sigma) \subseteq \Gamma(\tau),$$

$$D(k, \sigma, \tau) : \{\nu : (\exists \mu \supset \sigma)(D(k-1, \nu, \mu) \text{ is satisfied})\} \text{ is dense below } \tau$$

for $0 < k < n$, and

$$D(\rho) : \{\sigma : (\exists \tau \supset \rho\langle 1 \rangle)(D(n-1, \sigma, \tau) \text{ is satisfied})\} \text{ is dense below } \rho\langle 0 \rangle.$$

A $D(\rho)$ -module acts as below:

- (1) Pick the least $\mu \supset \rho\langle 0 \rangle$ such that no $\sigma \supseteq \mu$ has a $(\rho, n-1)$ -deputy defined.
- (2) Pick $\sigma \supset \mu$ with fresh length and define $d(\sigma)$, the $(n-1)$ -deputy of σ , as some $\tau \supset \rho\langle 1 \rangle$.
- (3) Extend the approximation of Γ so that $\Gamma(\sigma) \subset \Gamma(\tau)$.

For $D(k, \sigma, \tau)$ with $0 < k < n$, if at a $D(k, \sigma, \tau)$ -stage τ is already defined as the k -deputy of σ then the $D(k, \sigma, \tau)$ -module acts like a $D(\rho)$ -module:

- (1) Pick the least $\bar{\nu} \supset \tau$ such that the $(\tau, k-1)$ -deputy of ν is undefined for all $\nu \supseteq \bar{\nu}$.
- (2) Pick $\nu \supset \bar{\nu}$ with fresh length and define $d(\nu)$, the $(k-1)$ -deputy of ν , as some $\mu \supset \sigma$.
- (3) Extend the approximation of Γ so that $\Gamma(\mu) \supset \Gamma(\nu)$.

A $D(0, \sigma, \tau)$ -module simply does nothing, because if $\tau = d(\sigma)$ then $D(0, \sigma, \tau)$ is automatically satisfied when $d(\sigma)$ is defined by a $D(\rho)$ - or $D(1, -)$ -module.


FIGURE 1. The construction of deputies for $n = 2$.

Figure 2.2 shows a partial picture of the construction of deputies for $n = 2$, where τ_i 's are the 1-deputies of σ_i 's and μ_i 's the 0-deputies of ν_i 's.

Lemma 2.2. *If $D(n-k, \sigma, \tau)$ is satisfied and $\sigma \Vdash \varphi(\Gamma(G))$ for some Π_{n-k}^0 formula φ then $\tau \Vdash \varphi(\Gamma(G))$.*

Proof. The case for $n-k = 0$ holds as in the above examples.

Suppose that $n-k > 0$, $D(n-k, \sigma, \tau)$ is satisfied and $\tau \not\Vdash \varphi(\Gamma(G))$ for some Π_{n-k}^0 formula φ . Write φ as $(\forall y)\psi$ where ψ is Σ_{n-k-1}^0 . Then there exist j and $\bar{\nu} \supset \tau$ such that $\bar{\nu} \Vdash \neg\psi(\Gamma(G), j)$. Pick $\nu \supseteq \bar{\nu}$ and $\mu \supset \sigma$ such that $D(n-k-1, \nu, \mu)$ is satisfied. By the induction hypothesis, $\mu \Vdash \neg\psi(\Gamma(G), j)$ too. So $\sigma \not\Vdash \varphi(\Gamma(G))$. $\square$

2.3. Meeting (A3-4). To meet (A3), we have requirements demanding the convergence of $\Delta_k(\Gamma(G); \vec{x})$ for appropriate $\vec{x}$'s. If $k > 0$ then the corresponding modules attempt to meet the requirements by imposing constraints on modules for Δ_{k-1} . So we have n -layers of requirements.

But by (A2), Δ_{n-1} cannot be total. So the $(n-1)$ -th layer is different.

$$Q(n-1, \sigma, x_0) : (n=1 \rightarrow (\sigma(x_0) = 1 \leftrightarrow (\exists \tau \supseteq \sigma) \Delta(\Gamma(\tau); x_0) \downarrow = 1)) \text{ and} \\ (n > 1 \rightarrow (\sigma(x_0) = 1 \leftrightarrow (\exists \bar{x}, \tau \supseteq \sigma) \tau \Vdash (\forall x_1 > \bar{x}) \Delta_{n-2}(\Gamma(G); x_0, x_1) \downarrow = 1)).$$

If $\sigma(x_0) = 0$ then the $Q(n-1, \sigma, x_0)$ -module does nothing. Below assume that $\sigma(x_0) = 1$. If $n = 1$ and $\Delta(\Gamma(\sigma); x_0) \uparrow$ then the $Q(0, \sigma, x_0)$ -module picks $\tau \supset \sigma$ and extends Γ and Δ so that $\Delta(\Gamma(\tau); x_0) = 1$. For $n > 1$, the $Q(n-1, \sigma, x_0)$ -module is to impose a Q -constraint $c(n-2, \tau, x_0, \bar{x}, i)$ at the $(n-2)$ -th level. We design the Q -requirements and corresponding modules at lower layers so that the above Q -constraint is obeyed. As we can see later, obeying $c(n-2, \tau, x_0, \bar{x}, i)$ guarantees the desired forcing relation. But firstly the Q -module should check whether some $c(n-2, \zeta, x_0, \bar{y}, j)$ is already *active* at σ , i.e., $\zeta \subseteq \sigma$. If there is no such constraint, then it picks $\tau \supset \sigma$ and a fresh $\bar{x}$ and imposes a Q -constraint $c(n-2, \tau, x_0, \bar{x}, 1)$.

If $1 < k < n$, we have the following requirements:

$$Q(n-k, \sigma, \vec{x}) : (\exists \bar{x}, \tau \supset \sigma, i < 2) \tau \Vdash (\forall x_k > \bar{x}) \Delta_{n-k-1}(\Gamma(G); \vec{x}, x_k) \downarrow = i,$$

where $\vec{x}$ is of length k . A $Q(n-k, \sigma, \vec{x})$ -module picks a fresh $\bar{x}$, some $\tau \supset \sigma$ and some $i < 2$; then it imposes a Q -constraint $c(n-k-1, \tau, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ at the $(n-k-1)$ -th layer. Like Q -constraints at the $(n-2)$ -th layer, this Q -constraint is to be obeyed and eventually leads to the desired forcing relation. But if some $c(n-k-1, \xi, \vec{x}, \bar{z}, j)$ is already active at σ then this Q -module simply does nothing. Moreover, this module should make such a Q -constraint consistent with existing Q -constraints at the $(n-k)$ -th layer. If some $c(n-k, \xi, \vec{x} \upharpoonright k-1, \bar{y}, j)$ is active at σ and $\bar{y} < x_{k-1}$ then the equation $i = j$ should hold.

The $Q(0, \sigma, x_0)$'s for $n = 1$ has been treated. For $n > 1$, $Q(0, \sigma, \vec{x})$ is the following requirement:

$$(\exists \tau \supset \sigma, i < 2) \Delta(\Gamma(\tau); \vec{x}) \downarrow = i.$$

A $Q(0, \sigma, \vec{x})$ -module acts only if $\Delta(\Gamma(\sigma); \vec{x})$ is undefined. If it acts, the $Q(0, \sigma, \vec{x})$ -module firstly picks $\tau \supset \sigma$. If a constraint $c(0, \xi, \vec{x} \upharpoonright n-1, \bar{x}_{n-1}, i)$ is active at σ and $\bar{x}_{n-1} < x_{n-1}$, then this Q -module defines $\Delta(\Gamma(\tau); \vec{x}) \downarrow = i$; otherwise it defines $\Delta(\Gamma(\tau); \vec{x}) \downarrow = \tau(x_0)$.

By these basic strategies, we can prove that $\Delta_k(\Gamma(G))$ is total for all $k < n-1$ and all n -generic G . It seems that we even have the totality of $\Delta_{n-1}(\Gamma(G))$ and

$$(2.3) \quad G(x_0) = \Delta_{n-1}(\Gamma(G); x_0).$$

However, (2.3) contradicts (A2), since the totality of each $k < n-1$ implies that $\Delta_k(\Gamma(G); x_0, \dots, x_{n-k-1}) \downarrow = i$ is a Σ_{k+1}^0 predicate in $\Gamma(G)$ for each $k < n$. To avoid this contradiction, we have defined Q -modules in a way that seems more aggressive than necessary. For example, if $n > 1$ then it seems that a $Q(0, \sigma, \vec{x})$ -module only needs to act when there is no $\tau \supseteq \sigma$ with $\Delta(\Gamma(\tau); \vec{x})$ defined. But in fact it acts whenever $\Delta(\Gamma(\sigma); \vec{x})$ is undefined. That we can finally beat the mentioned contradiction is due to the combination of such aggressiveness and the new mechanism setup in §2.4. We can see in details how this combination plays its role in the proofs of Lemmata 2.11 and 2.13.

2.4. Conflicts and constraints. The basic modules have imposed the following constraints:

- The validity of Γ and Δ , i.e., if $\Gamma(\sigma)$ and $\Gamma(\tau)$ are defined and $\sigma \subset \tau$ then $\Gamma(\sigma) \subseteq \Gamma(\tau)$; if $\Delta(\mu; \vec{x})$ and $\Delta(\nu; \vec{x})$ are defined and $\mu \subset \nu$ then $\Delta(\mu; \vec{x}) = \Delta(\nu; \vec{x})$.
- The Q -constraints $c(k, \sigma, -)$.
- The consistency of Q -constraints, i.e., any two active contradicting Q -constraints, say $c(k, \zeta, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, 0)$ and $c(k, \eta, \vec{x}, \bar{y}, 1)$, must have ζ and η incomparable.

To bring the basic modules together, we must discuss the impact of these constraints on all modules

Partially for the validity of the two functionals, we setup two codes to be followed by every module at every stage:

- (C1) $\Gamma(\sigma) = \Gamma(\sigma \langle 1^k \rangle)$ for all σ and k .
- (C2) $\Delta(\xi) = \Delta(\xi \langle 1^k \rangle)$ for all ξ and k , i.e., $\Delta(\xi \langle 1^k \rangle; \vec{x}) \downarrow = i$ if and only if $\Delta(\xi; \vec{x}) \downarrow = i$.

If these codes are followed then it is easy to see that we can build valid functionals in some appropriate way.

We can also see from the above that the P - and Q -modules themselves do not break Q -constraints. However, D -modules could cause some problem. Consider the guiding example below: $n = 3$, $c(0, \zeta, x_0, x_1, \bar{x}_2, 0)$ is active at σ , τ is the 2-deputy of σ , some ν extending τ has a 1-deputy μ extending σ , another Q -constraint $c(0, \eta, x_0, x_1, \bar{y}_2, 1)$ is active at $\nu \supset \tau$. At some $\theta \supset \mu$, suppose that we follow the

first Q -constraint and define $\Delta(\Gamma(\theta); x_0, x_1, x_2) = 0$ for $x_2 > \max\{\bar{x}_2, \bar{y}_2\}$. Later we define a 0-deputy $d(\theta) \supset \nu$. Since $\Gamma(d(\theta)) \supset \Gamma(\theta)$, the second Q -constraint is broken by $d(\theta)$ though it is active at $d(\theta)$.

But if we examine the motivation of deputies then we can see a natural solution. Recall that if τ is the k -deputy of σ and σ forces a Π_k^0 predicate $\varphi(\Gamma(G))$ of $\Gamma(G)$ then τ should force $\varphi(\Gamma(G))$ as well. In the above example, the Q -constraint $c(0, \zeta, x_0, x_1, \bar{x}_2, 0)$ demands that ζ forces the Π_2^0 predicate

$$(2.4) \quad (\forall x_2 > \bar{x}_2)(\Delta(\Gamma(G); x_0, x_1, x_2) \downarrow = 0).$$

Since the Q -modules make $\Delta(\Gamma(G))$ a total 2-valued function, (2.4) is equivalent to the following Π_1^0 predicate of $\Gamma(G)$:

$$(2.5) \quad (\forall x_2 > \bar{x}_2) \neg (\Delta(\Gamma(G); x_0, x_1, x_2) \downarrow = 1).$$

As this constraint is active at σ and τ is the 2-deputy of σ , τ should also be demanded to force (2.5). When $D(\rho)$ defines $\tau = d(\sigma)$, it should impose a Q -constraint $c(0, \tau, x_0, x_1, \bar{x}_2, 0)$, which is called a *replica* of $c(0, \zeta, x_0, x_1, \bar{x}_2, 0)$. For the consistency of this action, we need two new codes:

(C3) If a D -module defines a deputy $\tau = d(\sigma)$ then $\tau = \rho\langle 1^k 0 \rangle$ with a fresh k and an appropriate ρ .

(C4) If a Q -constraint is active at any $\rho\langle 1^k \rangle$ then it is active at ρ .

Assume that (C3-4) are followed, we can pick τ such that no existing constraints like $c(0, \eta, x_0, x_1, \bar{y}_2, 1)$ are active at τ . So we solve the conflict in the guiding example. In general, if a D -module defines a k -deputy $\tau = d(\sigma)$ and a Q -constraint $c(j, \zeta, -)$ is active at σ with $j < k$, then this D -module should impose a new Q -constraint like $c(j, \tau, -)$ which is called a *replica* of $c(j, \zeta, -)$.

With the above adjustment, we explain the failure of (2.3) for $x_0 \notin G$ in a more technical way. Let us go back to the guiding example. Suppose that $x_0 = |\rho|$, $\rho\langle 0 \rangle \subseteq \sigma$ and $\rho\langle 1 \rangle \subseteq \tau$. The first Q -constraint active at σ implies that σ forces $\Delta_1(\Gamma(G); x_0, x_1) \downarrow = 0$ and is replicated to $c(0, \tau, x_0, x_1, \bar{x}_2, 0)$. Another Q -module could later impose a Q -constraint $c(0, \xi, x_0, y_1, \bar{y}_2, 1)$ which is active at $\nu \supset \tau$ and has $y_1 > x_1$. This new Q -constraint is later replicated to some $c(0, \mu, x_0, y_1, \bar{y}_2, 1)$ with $\mu = d(\nu) \supset \sigma$. Hence, for a generic G extending μ , we have $\Delta_1(\Gamma(G); x_0, x_1) = 0$ and $\Delta_1(\Gamma(G); x_0, y_1) = 1$. Due to the $D(\rho)$ -module, there are infinitely many such oscillations along G , causing $\Delta_2(\Gamma(G); x_0)$ undefined. On the other hand, no $\pi \supseteq \rho\langle 1 \rangle$ could have a 2-deputy above $\rho\langle 0 \rangle$. So such oscillations never happen to any generic $H \supset \rho\langle 1 \rangle$ and $\Delta_2(\Gamma(H); x_0)$ would output 1.

Moreover, we must guarantee that

$$(\forall x < |\sigma|)(\sigma(x) = 1 \rightarrow \tau(x) = 1)$$

whenever we define τ as the $(n-1)$ -deputy of σ , because if $\sigma(x) = 1$ then there could be some $c(n-2, \zeta, x, \bar{x}, 1)$ active at σ which would be replicated when $\tau = d(\sigma)$ is defined. Certainly we do not want to have any $c(n-2, \eta, x, \bar{x}, 1)$ active at τ if $\tau(x) = 0$. But the above condition can be easily met by choosing $\tau = \rho\langle 1^p 0 \rangle$ with p fresh when a $D(\rho)$ -module defines a $(n-1)$ -deputy.

2.5. The construction. As mentioned, we recursively assign countably many stages to each requirement so that every stage is assigned to exactly one requirement. At an R -stage s , the R -module acts as below.

$P(\sigma, m)$ -module: If there does not exist any $\tau \supseteq \sigma$ with $|\Gamma(\tau)| > m$ then pick a fresh number l and let $\tau = \sigma\langle 1^l 0 \rangle$ and $\Gamma(\tau) = \Gamma(\sigma)\langle 1^l 0 \rangle$.

$D(0, \sigma, \tau)$ -modules simply do nothing.

$D(k, \sigma, \tau)$ -module: If τ is not yet the k -deputy of σ then proceed to stage $s+1$. Suppose that τ is the k -deputy of σ . Pick the least $\bar{\nu} \supseteq \tau$ such that

no $\nu \supseteq \bar{\nu}$ has its $(\tau, k-1)$ -deputy defined. Pick a fresh number l and let $\nu = \bar{\nu}\langle 1^l 0 \rangle$. Let $d(\nu) = \sigma\langle 1^{\nu|} 0 \rangle$ and let $\Gamma(d(\nu)) = \Gamma(\nu)\langle 1^{\nu|} 0 \rangle$. Moreover, for every Q -constraint $c(j, \zeta, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ with $j < k-1$ and $\tau \subset \zeta \subset \nu$, impose a new Q -constraint $c(j, d(\nu), \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$.

$D(\rho)$ -module: Pick the least $\bar{\sigma} \supseteq \rho\langle 0 \rangle$ such that *no* $\sigma \supseteq \bar{\sigma}$ has its $(\rho, n-1)$ -deputy defined. Pick a fresh number l and let $\sigma = \bar{\sigma}\langle 1^l 0 \rangle$. Let $d(\sigma) = \rho\langle 1^{\sigma|} 0 \rangle$ and let $\Gamma(d(\sigma)) = \Gamma(\sigma)\langle 1^{\sigma|} 0 \rangle$. Moreover, for every Q -constraint $c(j, \zeta, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ with $j < n-1$ and $\rho \subset \zeta \subset \sigma$, impose a new Q -constraint $c(j, d(\sigma), \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$.

$Q(0, \sigma, \vec{x})$ -module for $n > 1$: If $\Delta(\Gamma(\sigma); \vec{x})$ is defined then proceed to stage $s+1$. Suppose that $\Delta(\Gamma(\sigma); \vec{x})$ is undefined. Pick a fresh number l and let $\xi = \Gamma(\sigma\langle 1^l 0 \rangle) = \Gamma(\sigma)\langle 1^l 0 \rangle$. If some Q -constraint $c(0, \rho, \vec{x} \upharpoonright n-1, \bar{x}, i)$ is active at σ and $x_{n-1} > \bar{x}$ then let $\Delta(\xi; \vec{x}) = i$. Otherwise let $\Delta(\xi; \vec{x}) = \sigma(x_0)$.

$Q(k, \sigma, \vec{x})$ -module where $n-1 > k > 0$: If some $c(k-1, \rho, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ is active at σ then proceed to stage $s+1$. Suppose that there is *no* Q -constraint as above. Pick a fresh number l and let $\tau = \sigma\langle 1^l 0 \rangle$. If some Q -constraint $c(k, \rho, \vec{x} \upharpoonright (n-k-1), \bar{x}, j)$ is active at σ and $x_{n-k-1} > \bar{x}$ then let $i = j$, otherwise let $i = \sigma(x_0)$. Impose a new Q -constraint $c(k-1, \tau, \vec{x}, l, i)$.

$Q(n-1, \sigma, x)$ -module: If one of the followings holds then proceed to stage $s+1$:

- $\sigma(x) = 0$,
- $n > 1$ and some $c(n-2, \rho, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ is active at σ , or
- $n = 1$ and $\Delta(\Gamma(\sigma); x) \downarrow$.

Suppose that none of the above conditions applies. Pick a fresh number l and let $\tau = \sigma\langle 1^l 0 \rangle$. Impose a new Q -constraint $c(n-2, \tau, x, l, 1)$ if $n > 1$, or define $\Gamma(\tau) = \Gamma(\sigma)\langle 1^l 0 \rangle$ and $\Delta(\Gamma(\tau); x) = 1$.

2.6. The verification. We verify that the construction produces the desired functionals by proving a series of lemmas.

Lemma 2.3. *(C1-4) hold*

Proof. It can be proved by an easy induction on stages. □

It is rather easy to see that the P 's are satisfied.

Lemma 2.4. *Γ is well-defined and $\Gamma(G)$ is total for every 1-generic G .*

Proof. Suppose that at the beginning of stage s we have:

- (1) Γ is well-defined, and
- (2) $\Gamma(\tau) \supset \Gamma(\sigma)$ whenever $\tau = d(\sigma)$.

Note that Γ is extended at stage s only if s is a P -, $D(k, -)$ - ($k > 0$), $D(\rho)$ - or $Q(0, -)$ -stage.

If s is a $P(\sigma, m)$ -stage then (1) holds at the end of stage s , by the induction hypothesis and (C1). Also (2) holds at the end of stage s as well, since d is not changed at stage s .

Suppose that $k > 0$ and s is a $D(k, \sigma, \tau)$ -stage. Then $\tau = d(\sigma)$. Suppose that the $D(k, \sigma, \tau)$ -module picks $\nu \supset \tau$ and defines $d(\nu) = \mu \supset \sigma$. By the induction hypothesis,

$$\Gamma(\mu) \supset \Gamma(\nu) \supseteq \Gamma(\tau) \supset \Gamma(\sigma).$$

So both (1) and (2) hold at the end of stage s .

The case for $D(\rho)$ -stage is similar to that of $D(k, -)$ -stage. And that of $Q(0, -)$ -stage is similar to that of P -stage. So Γ is well-defined.

Clearly every $P(\sigma, m)$ is satisfied and thus

$$\{\sigma : |\Gamma(\sigma)| > m\}$$

is dense for every m . Hence $\Gamma(G)$ is total for every 1-generic G . □

By the proof of Lemma 2.4, we have the following fact of deputies.

Lemma 2.5. *If $\tau = d(\sigma)$ then $\Gamma(\tau) \supset \Gamma(\sigma)$.*

Next we turn to the Q 's. It is important to learn how deputies and Q -constraints interact.

Lemma 2.6. *Suppose that τ_k is the $(n - k - 1)$ -deputy of σ_k .*

- (1) *If $k = 0$ then every Q -constraint $c(m, \eta, -)$ active at τ_k is either active at ρ or a replica of some $c(m, \zeta, -)$ with $\rho \subset \zeta \subset \sigma_k$, where ρ is the greatest common initial segment of σ_k and τ_k .*
- (2) *If $k > 0$ then there exist σ_{k-1} and τ_{k-1} such that*
 - (a) $\sigma_{k-1} \subset \sigma_k$ and $\tau_{k-1} \subset \tau_k$;
 - (b) σ_{k-1} is the $(n - k)$ -deputy of τ_{k-1} and τ_k is the $(\sigma_{k-1}, n - k - 1)$ -deputy of σ_k ;
 - (c) *every Q -constraint $c(m, \eta, -)$ active at τ_k is either active at τ_{k-1} or a replica of some $c(m, \zeta, -)$ with $\sigma_{k-1} \subset \zeta \subset \sigma_k$.*
- (3) *If $m < n - k - 1$ then for every $c(m, \eta, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ active at τ_k there exists $c(m, \zeta, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ active at σ_k and for every $c(m, \mu, \vec{y}, \bar{y}, j)$ active at σ_k there exists $c(m, \nu, \vec{y}, \bar{y}, j)$ active at τ_k .*

Proof. (1) and (2) are trivial facts of the construction.

For $k = 0$, (3) holds trivially. Suppose that $k > 0$. There exist σ_{k-1} and τ_{k-1} as in (2). If $c(m, \eta, -)$ is active at τ_{k-1} then the conclusion follows from the induction hypothesis, otherwise it is a replica of some $c(m, \zeta, -)$ active at σ_k and the conclusion holds as well. For $c(m, \mu, -)$, if $\sigma_{k-1} \subset \mu$ then it has a replica $c(m, \tau_k, -)$; otherwise it is active at σ_{k-1} and the conclusion follows from the induction hypothesis. $\square$

The following fact implies that Q -constraints are arranged consistently.

Lemma 2.7. *For each $k, \vec{x}, \sigma$ there exists at most one $c(k, \zeta, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ active at σ .*

Proof. Suppose that the lemma holds at the end of stage $s - 1$. We prove that it also holds at the end of stage s . Since new Q -constraints are imposed only at Q - or D -stages, there are three cases.

- (i) s is a Q -stage. The conclusion is guaranteed by the construction.
- (ii) s is a $D(k', \sigma, \tau)$ -stage. Then τ is the k' -deputy of σ . Suppose that the D -module picks $\bar{\nu} \supset \tau$ and $\nu = \bar{\nu}(1^p 0)$ and defines $\mu = d(\nu) = \sigma(1^q 0)$. It suffices to prove that if $c(k, \zeta, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ and $c(k, \eta, \vec{x}, \bar{y}, j)$ are active at μ then $\zeta = \eta$, $\bar{x} = \bar{y}$ and $i = j$. By the induction hypothesis and (2) of Lemma 2.6, we may assume that $\zeta = \mu$ and $c = c(k, \zeta, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ is imposed at stage s . So $k' > k$ and c is a replica of some $c_0 = c(k, \zeta_0, -)$ active at ν and imposed before stage s . If $c' = c(k, \eta, \vec{x}, \bar{y}, j)$ is also a replica of some $c'_0 = c(k, \eta_0, -)$ then $\bar{x} = \bar{y}$ and $i = j$ by the induction hypothesis and $\eta = \zeta = \mu$ by the $D(k', \sigma, \tau)$ -module. So c and c' coincide. If c' is not a replica then it is active at σ . By (3) of Lemma 2.6 and that $k' > k$, there exists $c'_1 = c(k, \rho, \vec{x}, \bar{y}, j)$ active at τ . By the induction hypothesis again, c_0 and c'_1 coincide. However, this coincidence implies that $\zeta_0 \subseteq \tau$ and c_0 has no replica imposed at stage s by the $D(k', \sigma, \tau)$ -module.
- (iii) s is a $D(\rho)$ -stage. The proof for this case is similar to that for (ii). $\square$

Lemma 2.8. Δ is well-defined.

Proof. Lemma 2.7 implies that a $Q(0, -)$ module never encounters conflicting $c(0, -)$'s. So the validity of Δ follows from (C2). $\square$

If some $c(k, \zeta, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ is active then we expect that ζ forces $\Delta_k(\Gamma(G); \vec{x}, x) \downarrow = i$ for all $x > \bar{x}$. The next lemma is important for this end.

Lemma 2.9. *If $\zeta \subset \eta$ and $c(k, \zeta, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ and $c(k-1, \eta, \vec{y}, \bar{y}, j)$ are active then $\bar{x} < \bar{y}$.*

Proof. Assume that the lemma holds for Q -constraints imposed before stage s . Let $c_k = c(k, \zeta, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ and $c_{k-1} = c(k-1, \eta, \vec{y}, \bar{y}, j)$ and assume that $\zeta \subset \eta$. By the construction, c_k is imposed before c_{k-1} . Assume that c_{k-1} is imposed at stage s .

If s is a Q -stage then c_k is imposed before stage s and the conclusion follows immediately from the construction.

Suppose that s is a $D(k', \sigma, \tau)$ -stage. Then τ is the k' -deputy of σ , $k' - 1 > k - 1$, and η is the $(k' - 1)$ -deputy of some $\nu \supset \tau$ and c_{k-1} is a replica of some $c'_{k-1} = c(k-1, \eta', -)$ with $\tau \subset \eta' \subset \nu$. Since $\zeta \neq \eta$, c_k is not such a replica and thus $\zeta \subseteq \sigma$. By (3) of Lemma 2.6 and that $k' > k$, there exists some $c'_k = c(k, \xi, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ active at τ . So both c'_k and c'_i are imposed before stage s and thus $\bar{x} < \bar{y}$ by the induction hypothesis.

The case that s is a $D(\rho)$ -stage is similar to the above. $\square$

By the lemma below, if some $c(k, \zeta, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ is active then it is obeyed by the Q -modules at the $(k-1)$ -th layer.

Lemma 2.10. *Suppose that $|\vec{x}| = n - k - 1$, $x > \bar{x}$ and $c(k, \xi, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ is active at μ .*

- (1) *If $k > 0$ and $c(k-1, \mu, \vec{x}, x, \bar{y}, j)$ is also active then $j = i$.*
- (2) *If $k = 0$ and $\Delta(\Gamma(\mu); \vec{x}, x) \downarrow = j$ then $j = i$.*

Proof. Let $c_k = c(k, \xi, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$. Assume that both (1) and (2) hold before stage s .

(1) Assume that $k > 0$ and $c_{k-1} = c(k-1, \mu, \vec{x}, x, \bar{y}, j)$ is imposed at stage s . So s is a Q - or D -stage. Note that $\bar{y} > x > \bar{x}$ by the construction.

If s is a Q -stage then c_k is imposed before stage s and trivially $j = i$.

If s is a $D(\rho)$ -stage then μ is the $(n-1)$ -deputy of some $\nu \supset \rho$ and c_{k-1} is a replica of some c'_{k-1} active at ν . So either $\xi \subseteq \rho$, or $\xi = \mu$ and c_k is also a replica of some c'_k active at ν . In the former case, from the induction hypothesis for c'_{k-1} and c_k it follows that $j = i$. In the latter case, by Lemma 2.9 and that $\bar{x} < x < \bar{y}$, c'_k and c'_{k-1} are respectively of the forms $c(k, \xi', -)$ and $c(k-1, \mu', -)$ with $\xi' \subseteq \mu'$. By the induction hypothesis for c'_k and c'_{k-1} , $j = i$ as well.

Suppose that s is a $D(k', \sigma, \tau)$ -stage. Then τ is the k' -deputy of σ and μ is the $(k' - 1)$ -deputy of some $\nu \supset \tau$. Moreover, $k' - 1 > k - 1$ and c_{k-1} is a replica of some c'_{k-1} active at ν . If c_k is also a replica of some c'_k active at ν then the conclusion follows from Lemma 2.9 and the induction hypothesis for c'_{k-1} and c'_k . Suppose that c_k is not such a replica. Then c_k is active at σ by (2) of Lemma 2.6. By (3) of Lemma 2.6, there exists $c''_k = c(k, \zeta, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ active at τ . So $j = i$ by the induction hypothesis for c''_k and c'_{k-1} .

(2) We may assume that $\Delta(\Gamma(\mu \upharpoonright (|\mu| - 1); \vec{x}, x) \uparrow)$. So $\Gamma(\mu)$ is explicitly defined in the construction at some stage s .

If $\Gamma(\mu)$ is explicitly defined by a P -module then $\Delta(\Gamma(\mu); \vec{x}, x)$ diverges too as $\Gamma(\mu)$ is of a fresh length.

If $\Gamma(\mu)$ is explicitly defined by a $D(\rho)$ -module then μ is the $(n-1)$ -deputy of some ν which is of the form $\bar{\nu}(1^p 0)$ for some $\bar{\nu} \supset \rho$. Moreover, $\Delta(\Gamma(\mu); \vec{x}, x) = \Delta(\Gamma(\bar{\nu}); \vec{x}, x)$. Since there are active Q -constraints, $n > 1$. By (3) of Lemma 2.6, there exists $c' = c(0, \zeta, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ active at $\bar{\nu}$. By the induction hypothesis for c' and $\bar{\nu}$, $j = i$.

The case where $\Gamma(\mu)$ is explicitly defined by a $D(k', \sigma, \tau)$ -module is similar to the above paragraph.

If $\Gamma(\mu)$ is explicitly defined by a Q -module then the conclusion is a trivial fact of Q -modules. $\square$

Now we can prove the satisfaction of the Q 's for $n = 1$.

Lemma 2.11. *If $n = 1$ and $x < |\sigma|$ then $Q(n - 1, \sigma, x)$ is satisfied. Hence*

$$(\forall x)(x \in G \leftrightarrow \Delta(\Gamma(G); x) \downarrow = 1)$$

for every 1-generic G .

Proof. Suppose that $x < |\sigma|$ and $\sigma(x) = 1$. By the $Q(0, \sigma, x)$ -module there exists $\tau \supset \sigma$ with $\Delta(\Gamma(\tau); x) \downarrow = 1$.

For the other direction, assume that σ is the shortest such that

$$(2.6) \quad (\exists x)(\sigma(x) = 0 \wedge \Delta(\Gamma(\sigma); x) \downarrow = 1).$$

Fix an x satisfying the matrix of (2.6). We may assume that $\Delta(\Gamma(\sigma \upharpoonright (|\sigma| - 1)); x) \uparrow$. So $\Gamma(\sigma)$ is explicitly defined in the construction at some stage s . If s is a P -stage then $\sigma = \rho(1^l 0)$ for some fresh l and no new computation of Δ is enumerated. Thus (2.6) cannot hold by the choice of σ . If s is a $Q(0, \sigma, x)$ -stage then by the construction nothing happens at stage s . Suppose that s is a $D(\rho)$ -stage. Then σ is the deputy of some $\tau \supseteq \rho \langle 0 \rangle$, $\sigma = \rho \langle 1^{\tau \upharpoonright 0} \rangle$ and $\Delta(\Gamma(\sigma)) = \Delta(\Gamma(\tau))$. So $\Delta(\Gamma(\sigma); |\sigma| - 1)$ is undefined and $x < |\sigma| - 1$. As $\sigma(x) = 0$, $x < |\rho|$. But then $\tau(x) = \rho(x) = 0$ and $\Delta(\Gamma(\tau); x) = 1$, contradicting the choice of σ .

So $Q(0, \sigma, x)$ is satisfied. The other half follows easily from the first half. $\square$

For $n > 1$, the satisfaction of the Q 's follows from the next two lemmata.

Lemma 2.12. *Suppose that $n \geq k > 1$. If $c(n - k, \sigma, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ is active then*

$$\sigma \Vdash (\forall x_{k-1} > \bar{x}) \Delta_{n-k}(\Gamma(G); \vec{x}, x_{k-1}) \downarrow = i$$

and thus

$$\sigma \Vdash \Delta_{n-k+1}(\Gamma(G); \vec{x}) \downarrow = i$$

So every $Q(n - k, \sigma, \vec{x})$ is satisfied.

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on $n - k$.

Suppose that $n - k = 0$. By the construction, for every $\vec{x}$ of length n the following set is recursive and dense

$$\{\sigma : \Delta(\Gamma(\sigma); \vec{x}) \downarrow\}.$$

Furthermore, assume that $c(0, \sigma, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ is active and $\Delta(\Gamma(\mu); \vec{x}, x_{n-1}) \downarrow = j$ where $x_{n-1} > \bar{x}$ and $\mu \supset \sigma$. By (2) of Lemma 2.10, $j = i$. Hence

$$\sigma \Vdash (\forall x_{n-1} > \bar{x}) \Delta(\Gamma(G); \vec{x}, x_{n-1}) \downarrow = i.$$

Suppose that $n - k > 0$. By the construction, for every $\vec{x}$ of length k the following set is recursive and dense

$$\{\tau : \text{there exists an active } c(n - k - 1, \tau, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)\}.$$

Furthermore, assume that both $c(n - k, \sigma, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ and $c(n - k - 1, \mu, \vec{x}, x, \bar{z}, j)$ are active, $x > \bar{x}$ and μ is comparable with σ . By Lemma 2.9 and that $\bar{z} > x$, $\sigma \subseteq \mu$. By (1) of Lemma 2.10, $j = i$. So the following set is dense below σ for every $x > \bar{x}$

$$\{\tau : \tau \Vdash \Delta_{n-k}(\Gamma(G); \vec{x}, x) \downarrow = i\}$$

and σ forces $(\forall x_{k-1} > \bar{x}) \Delta_{n-k}(\Gamma(G); \vec{x}, x_{k-1}) \downarrow = i$ and $\Delta_{n-k+1}(\Gamma(G); \vec{x}) \downarrow = i$.

By the construction, every $Q(n - k, \sigma, \vec{x})$ -module guarantees that some $c(n - k - 1, \tau, \vec{x}, \bar{x}, i)$ is active with $\tau \supseteq \sigma$. So $Q(n - k, \sigma, \vec{x})$ is satisfied. $\square$

Lemma 2.13. *If $n > 1$ and x and σ are such that $|\sigma| > x$ then*

$$\sigma(x) = 1 \rightarrow \sigma \Vdash \Delta_{n-1}(\Gamma(G); x) \downarrow = 1$$

and

$$\sigma(x) = 0 \rightarrow \sigma \Vdash \neg(\Delta_{n-1}(\Gamma(G); x) \downarrow = 1).$$

Hence for $n > 1$ every $Q(n - 1, \sigma, x)$ is satisfied.

Proof. Suppose that $\sigma(x) = 1$. By the $Q(n-1, -, x)$ -modules, for every $\mu \supset \sigma$ there exists some $c(n-2, \zeta, x, \bar{x}, i)$ with $\zeta \supset \mu$. Since no module can ever impose any $c(n-2, \xi, y, \bar{y}, 0)$, $i = 1$. By Lemma 2.12,

$$\sigma \Vdash \Delta_{n-1}(\Gamma(G); x) \downarrow = 1$$

On the other hand, suppose that $\sigma(x) = 0$.

Claim 2.14. *There is no active $c(n-2, \zeta, x, \bar{x}, 1)$ such that ζ and σ are comparable.*

Proof of Claim 2.14. For a contradiction, assume that there exists such an active $c(n-2, \zeta, x, \bar{x}, 1)$. By Q -modules, $|\zeta| > x$. So we may assume that $\zeta = \sigma$ and σ is the shortest with such a constraint. Clearly such a Q -constraint cannot be imposed by a Q -module. As a $D(n-k, -)$ -module only imposes $c(j, -)$ with $j < n-k-1$, the above constraint cannot be imposed by a $D(n-k, -)$ -module either. Suppose that a $D(\rho)$ -module imposes c . Then $\sigma \supset \rho\langle 1 \rangle$ and σ is the deputy of some $\tau \supset \rho\langle 0 \rangle$. By (3) of Lemma 2.6, there exists some $c(n-2, \eta, x, \bar{x}, 1)$ active at τ . As $\tau(y) = 1$ implies $\sigma(y) = 1$ for all y , $\sigma(x) = 0$ implies $\eta(x) = \tau(x) = 0$ too, contradicting the choice of σ . $\square$

Let $\mu \supset \sigma$ be arbitrary. By Claim 2.14, no $c(n-2, \zeta, x, \bar{x}, 1)$ is active at μ . Note that there are at most finitely many Q -constraints active at μ . So for x_1 sufficiently large, either $n > 2$ and no $c(n-3, \xi, x, x_1, -)$ is active at μ or $n = 2$ and $\Delta(\Gamma(\mu); x, x_1) \uparrow$. By the $Q(n-2, \mu, x, x_1)$ -module, either $n > 2$ and there exists an active $c(n-3, \tau, x, x_1, \bar{y}, 0)$ with $\tau \supset \mu$, or $n = 2$ and $\Delta(\Gamma(\tau); x, x_1) \downarrow = 0$ for some $\tau \supset \mu$. Either case implies that for each $\bar{x}$ the following set is dense below σ

$$\{\tau : (\exists x_1 > \bar{x}) \tau \Vdash \Delta_{n-2}(\Gamma(G); x, x_1) \downarrow = 0\}.$$

Hence

$$\sigma \Vdash \neg(\Delta_{n-1}(\Gamma(G); x) \downarrow = 1).$$

It follows that $Q(n-1, \sigma, x)$ is satisfied. $\square$

By Lemma 2.12 and that the following set is dense and recursive

$$\{\sigma : \text{some } c(n-k-1, \sigma, \bar{x}, x, i) \text{ is active}\},$$

$\Delta_{n-k}(\Gamma(G))$ is G -recursive for $n \geq k > 1$ and every 1-generic G . Then by Lemma 2.13, every 1-generic G is Σ_k^0 in $\Delta_{n-k}(\Gamma(G))$.

Finally, we prove the satisfaction of the D 's and also (A2).

Lemma 2.15. *If τ is defined as the k -deputy of σ then $D(k, \sigma, \tau)$ is satisfied.*

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on k .

By Lemma 2.5, the lemma holds for $k = 0$.

Suppose that $k > 0$ and τ is defined as the k -deputy of σ . By the $D(k, \sigma, \tau)$ -module, the set below is dense below τ

$$\{\nu : (\exists \mu \supset \sigma)(\mu \text{ is the } (k-1)\text{-deputy of } \nu)\}.$$

By the induction hypothesis, the following set is also dense below τ

$$\{\nu : (\exists \mu \supset \sigma)(D(k-1, \nu, \mu) \text{ is satisfied})\}.$$

So $D(k, \sigma, \tau)$ is satisfied. $\square$

Lemma 2.16. *Every $D(\rho)$ is satisfied. Hence G is not Π_n^0 in $\Gamma(G)$ for every n -generic G .*

Proof. By the $D(\rho)$ -module, the set below is dense below $\rho\langle 0 \rangle$

$$\{\sigma : (\exists \tau \supset \rho\langle 1 \rangle)(\tau \text{ is the } (n-1)\text{-deputy of } \sigma)\}.$$

By Lemma 2.15, the following set is also dense below $\rho\langle 0 \rangle$

$$\{\sigma : (\exists \tau \supset \rho\langle 1 \rangle)(D(n-1, \sigma, \tau) \text{ is satisfied})\}.$$

Hence $D(\rho)$ is satisfied.

Suppose that G is n -generic. Then $\Gamma(G)$ is total by Lemma 2.4. Let $X = \Gamma(G)$. Assume that $\omega - G$ equals

$$S = \{x : (\exists y)\varphi(x, y)\}$$

for some φ which is Π_{n-1}^0 in X . For each $x \notin G$ let $\rho_x = G \upharpoonright x$. By the n -genericity of G , let σ_x be an initial segment of G such that $\rho_x \subset \sigma_x$, $\sigma_x \Vdash \varphi(x, y)$ for some y and the $(n-1)$ -deputy of σ_x is defined as $\tau_x \supset \rho\langle 1 \rangle$. By the first part of this lemma and Lemma 2.2, $\tau_x \Vdash \varphi(x, y)$. So the following Σ_n^0 set is dense along G

$$D = \{\tau : (\exists x < |\tau|)(\tau(x) = 1 \wedge \tau \Vdash (\exists y)\varphi(x, y))\}.$$

As G is n -generic, it has an initial segment σ in D . So $\omega - G \neq S$. $\square$

So we prove Theorem 2.1. Moreover, by the last two lemmata and the remark preceding Lemma 2.15, every n -generic G is properly Σ_k^0 in $\Delta_{n-k}(\Gamma(G))$ for $n \geq k > 1$.

3. REMARKS

Recall that for positive n a set X is *generalized low $_n$* (GL_n for short) if

$$X^{(n)} \equiv_T (X \oplus \emptyset')^{(n-1)}.$$

Every n -generic G satisfies $G^{(n)} \equiv_T G \oplus \emptyset^{(n)}$ and thus is GL_n ([6, Lemma 2.6]). Jockusch proved that every 2-generic bounds some X which is GL_2 but not GL_1 as a corollary of the relative recursive enumerability of 1-generics ([6, Corollary 5.5]). Similarly he also proved that every 3-generic bounds a set in $GL_3 - GL_2$ ([6, Corollary 5.11]). Then Jockusch conjectured that every $(n+1)$ -generic bounds a set in $GL_{n+1} - GL_n$ for all positive n ([6, Conjecture 5.14]). Below we confirm this conjecture.

Firstly, by relativizing the corresponding proof we have an analog of Lemma 2.2.

Lemma 3.1. *Let Y be fixed. If $D(n-1, \sigma, \tau)$ is satisfied and $\sigma \Vdash \varphi$ for some φ which is Π_{n-1}^0 in $\Gamma(G) \oplus Y$ then $\tau \Vdash \varphi$ as well.*

Corollary 3.2. *For $n > 0$, every $(n+1)$ -generic bounds a set in $GL_{n+1} - GL_n$.*

Proof. Let Γ be the functional constructed in §2 for n and let G be an arbitrary $(n+1)$ -generic. Then $\Gamma(G)$ is total and G is Σ_n^0 in $\Gamma(G)$.

Let $X = \Gamma(G)$. We claim that G is not Π_n^0 in $X \oplus \emptyset'$. For a contradiction, assume that φ is Π_{n-1}^0 in $X \oplus \emptyset'$ and the complement of G equals the following set

$$S = \{x : (\exists y)\varphi(x, y)\}.$$

For each $x \notin G$, let $\rho_x = G \upharpoonright x$ and let σ_x be an extension of $\rho_x\langle 0 \rangle$ forcing $\varphi(\Gamma(G), x, y)$ for some y . As φ is Π_{n-1}^0 in $X \oplus \emptyset'$, φ is Π_n^0 in G for $n > 1$ or Δ_2^0 in G for $n = 1$. By the $(n+1)$ -genericity of G , σ_x exists. By the construction in §2, there exists $\tau_x \supset \rho_x\langle 1 \rangle$ which is the $(n-1)$ -deputy of some extension of σ_x . By Lemma 3.1, $\tau_x \Vdash \varphi(x, y)$ too. So the set below is dense along G

$$T = \{\tau : (\exists x < |\tau|)(\tau(x) = 1 \wedge \tau \Vdash (\exists y)\varphi(x, y))\}.$$

Note that T is Σ_{n+1}^0 . By the $(n+1)$ -genericity of G , there exists a finite initial segment of G in T . Thus $G \cap S \neq \emptyset$, giving us the desired contradiction.

So $G \leq_T X^{(n)}$ but $G \not\leq_T (X \oplus \emptyset')^{(n-1)}$. Hence $X \notin GL_n$. On the other hand,

$$X^{(n+1)} \leq_T G^{(n+1)} \equiv_T G \oplus \emptyset^{(n+1)} \leq_T (X \oplus \emptyset')^{(n)} \leq_T X^{(n+1)}.$$

Thus $X \in GL_{n+1}$. $\square$

The above proof is an application of deputies. As another application, we obtain the following corollary strengthening Theorem 2.1 and also [2, Theorem 3]. Let us recall some notions before stating the corollary. Let $(D_i : i \in \omega)$ be a fixed enumeration of all finite sets such that $x \in D_i$ and $|D_i|$ are uniformly recursive in both x and i . A *strong array* is a pairwise disjoint subsequence of $(D_i : i \in \omega)$. A set X is *hyperimmune* in another set Y if for any Y -recursive strong array $(D_{k_i} : i \in \omega)$ there exists i such that $X \cap D_{k_i} = \emptyset$.

Corollary 3.3. *If $n > 0$ and G is n -generic then there exists $X \leq_T G$ such that G is Σ_n^0 in X and the complement of G is hyperimmune in $X^{(n-1)}$.*

Proof. Fix $n > 0$. Let Γ be the functional constructed in §2. Then $X = \Gamma(G)$ is recursive in G and G is Σ_n^0 in X .

For a contradiction, assume that Φ is a Turing machine such that $f = \Phi(X^{(n-1)})$ is total and $(D_{f(i)} : i \in \omega)$ is a strong array witnessing the complement of G being non-hyperimmune in $X^{(n-1)}$. Let $\varphi(i, x)$ be a formula asserting that $f(i) = x$ which is Σ_n^0 in X . Write $\varphi(i, x)$ as $(\exists y)\psi(i, x, y)$ where ψ is Π_{n-1}^0 in $\Gamma(G)$. For each m , let $\rho_m = G \upharpoonright m$ and let i_m and k_m be such that $f(i_m) = k_m$ and $m < \min D_{k_m}$. By the n -genericity of G , there exist $\sigma_m \subset G$ and y_m such that $\max D_{k_m} < |\sigma_m|$ and σ_m forces $\psi(i_m, k_m, y_m)$. Let l_m be the least l such that $l \in D_{k_m}$ and $\sigma_m(l) = 0$. As $m < \min D_{k_m}$, $l_m > m$ and $\rho_m \subset \sigma_m \upharpoonright l_m$. By the construction in §2, there exists τ_m such that

- τ_m extends $(\sigma_m \upharpoonright l_m)\langle 1 \rangle$,
- τ_m is the $(\sigma_m \upharpoonright l_m, n-1)$ -deputy of some extension of σ_m , and
- $\tau_m(x) = 1$ for all $x \in D_{k_m}$.

By Lemma 2.2, $\tau_m \Vdash \psi(i_m, k_m, y_m)$ and thus $\tau_m \Vdash \varphi(i_m, k_m)$. So the following Σ_n^0 set is dense along G

$$T = \{\tau : (\exists i, k)\tau \Vdash (D_k \subset G \wedge \Phi(\Gamma(G); i) \downarrow = k)\}.$$

By the n -genericity of G , G meets T , i.e., there exists an initial segment of G in T . So $D_{f(i)} \subset G$ for some i and we have the desired contradiction. $\square$

Kumabe [7] obtained a strengthening of the relative recursive enumerability of 1-generics that for every positive n and every n -generic G there exists a G -recursive n -generic H such that G is recursively enumerable but not recursive in H . So it is natural to ask whether Theorem 2 allows such a stronger version. More precisely,

Question 3.4. *For positive n , is every n -generic G properly Σ_n^0 in another n -generic H which is recursive in G ?*

As mentioned, the r.e.a. degrees form a large class. Let $\mathbf{R}_1$ denote this class, and in general let $\mathbf{R}_n$ denote the class whose definition is obtained from replacing recursive enumerability by being Σ_n^0 in the definition of R . Kurtz [9] (see also [5, Theorem 8.21.8]) proved that $\mathbf{R}_1$ includes the degrees of 2-random reals. So we may ask whether a parallel property holds for n -randoms with $n > 2$.

Question 3.5. *For $n > 2$, is every n -random X properly Σ_{n-1}^0 in some X -recursive Y ? Does $\mathbf{R}_{n-1}$ include the n -random degrees?*

There are upper cones of r.e.a. degrees. Ambos-Spies et al. [1] showed that if a degree bounds a non- $\mathbf{GL}_2$ -degree then it is r.e.a. Cai [3] strengthened this result by showing that a degree $\mathbf{x}$ contains an array-non-recursive set if and only

if every degree above $\mathbf{x}$ is r.e.a. So in $(\mathbf{D}, \leq, \mathbf{R}_1)$ where $(\mathbf{D}, \leq)$ is the partial order of the Turing degrees, array-recursiveness is definable. It might also be interesting to investigate the relation between $\mathbf{GL}_{n+1}$ and $\mathbf{R}_n$ and also the definable sets in $(\mathbf{D}, \leq, \mathbf{R}_n)$.

REFERENCES

- [1] Klaus Ambos-Spies, Decheng Ding, Wei Wang, and Liang Yu. Bounding non- GL_2 and r.e.a. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 74(3):989–1000, 2009.
- [2] Bernard A. Anderson. Relatively computably enumerable reals. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 50(3-4):361–365, 2011.
- [3] Mingzhong Cai. Array nonrecursiveness and relative recursive enumerability. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 77(1):21–32, 2012.
- [4] Mingzhong Cai and Richard Shore. Domination, forcing, array nonrecursiveness and relative recursive enumerability. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 77:226–239, 2012.
- [5] Rod Downey and Denis Hirschfeldt. *Algorithmic Randomness and Complexity*. Theory and Applications of Computability. Springer, 2010.
- [6] Carl G. Jockusch, Jr. Degrees of generic sets. In F. R. Drake and S. S. Wainer, editors, *Recursion Theory: Its Generalizations and Applications, Proceedings of Logic Colloquium '79, Leeds, August 1979*, pages 110–139, Cambridge, U. K., 1980. Cambridge University Press.
- [7] Masahiro Kumabe. Relative recursive enumerability of generic degrees. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 56(3):1075–1084, 1991.
- [8] Masahiro Kumabe. Degrees of generic sets. In *Computability, enumerability, unsolvability*, volume 224 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 167–183. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- [9] Stuart Kurtz. *Randomness and Genericity in the degrees of unsolvability*. PhD thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1981.
- [10] C.E.M. Yates. Initial segments of the degrees of unsolvability, part ii: Minimal degrees. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 35:243–266, 1970.

INSTITUTE OF LOGIC AND COGNITION AND DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY, SUN YAT-SEN UNIVERSITY, 135 XINGANG XI ROAD, GUANGZHOU 510275, P.R. CHINA
E-mail address: `wwang.cn@gmail.com`